



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

M-F

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/019,450	05/28/2002	Ravi Chandran	12447US02	4359
7590 McAndrews Held & Malloy 34th Floor 500 W Madison Street Chicago, IL 60661		02/15/2007	EXAMINER WOZNIAK, JAMES S	
			ART UNIT 2626	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	02/15/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/019,450	CHANDRAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	James S. Wozniak	2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 November 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 5/28/2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 6/8/2006, the applicant has submitted an amendment, filed 11/8/2006, amending claims 1, 9, 14, 25, 31, 44, and 55, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the amended limitations (*Amendment, Pages 24-25*). The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection, necessitated by the amended claims and in further view of Yajima et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,873,058*) and Kwan (*U.S. Patent: 6,504,838*).

2. In response to the amendment of claims 1, 25, and 55, the examiner has withdrawn the previous 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection drawn to single means claims.

Response to Arguments

3. In response to the applicants' arguments that amended claim 55 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection (*Amendment, Page 23*), the examiner notes that controlling the noise characteristic of a compressed digitized audio signal still constitutes non-statutory subject matter because the claim is still directed to abstract digital data (*0's and 1's*) and not a tangible audio output. In other words, the final result must be useful, tangible, and concrete, whereas manipulated digital bits are still abstract (*see Interim Guidelines for examination of Patent Applications for Patent*

Subject Matter Eligibility, Pages 37-39). Thus, the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejection of Claims 55-60 is maintained.

Claim Objections

4. **Claims 1-24 and claims 55-60** are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 1, line 7, “the first characteristic” should be changed to --a first characteristic-- in order to provide proper antecedent basis.

Dependent claims 2-24 fail to overcome the objection directed towards claim 1, and thus, are also rejected due to minor informalities.

In claim 55, line 21, “the noise characteristic” should be changed to --a noise characteristic-- in order to provide proper antecedent basis.

Dependent claims 56-60 fail to overcome the objection directed towards claim 1, and thus, are also rejected due to minor informalities.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. **Claims 1-30** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 and 25 are directed to an *apparatus* for changing an audio signal level comprising a transmitter for transmitting digital signals using a compression code and a processor responsive to the transmitted digital signals to adjust an audio signal level. Based on the current claim language, it is uncertain whether the applicant is claiming the system shown in Fig. 24 or simply the network automatic level control (ALC) device (Element 40) because the preamble refers to the level changing apparatus, but the body of the claim refers to the overall system shown in Fig. 24 (*i.e., the originating transmitters are located in the handsets*). The examiner has interpreted claims 1 and 25 as corresponding to the system shown in Fig. 24 for the application of the prior art of record. If the applicant desires to claim only the ALC apparatus (Element 40), the examiner recommends claiming the partial decoder used to receive transmitted coded audio signals. Amendment to either the system in place of the apparatus or the apparatus featuring the partial decoders is recommended to overcome this rejection.

Dependent claims 2-24 and 26-30 fail to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection directed towards claims 1 and 25, and thus are also indefinite.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. **Claims 55-60** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

As per the MPEP (2106 [R-3], IV):

In practical terms, claims define nonstatutory processes if they:

- consist solely of mathematical operations without some claimed practical application (i.e., executing a “mathematical algorithm”); or
- simply manipulate abstract ideas, e.g., a bid (*Schrader*, 22 F.3d at 293-94, 30 USPQ2d at 1458-59) or a bubble hierarchy (*Warmerdam*, 33 F.3d at 1360, 31 USPQ2d at 1759), without some claimed practical application.

In the particular case of Claim 55, the claimed subject matter is directed towards a method comprising “adjusting first bits and second bits,” which is merely a manipulation of abstract data in a processing device that does not, in itself, produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Dependent claims 56-60 do not remedy the non-statutory subject matter issue noted above with respect to claim 55, and therefore, are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as being directed towards non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 1-6, 10-11, 15, 24, 31-36, 38, 40-41, 45, and 54** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jarvinen et al (U.S. Patent: 5,946,651) in view of Yajima et al (U.S. Patent: 5,873,058).

With respect to **Claims 1 and 31**, Jarvinen discloses:

In a communications system for transmitting digital signals using a compression code comprising a predetermined plurality of parameters including a first parameter, said parameters representing an audio signal comprising a plurality of audio characteristics including a first characteristic, said first parameter being related to said first characteristic (*receiving transmitted coded speech parameters at a decoder including LPC coefficients and a gain parameter, Col. 6, Lines 16-58*) said compression code being decodable by a plurality of decoding steps including a first decoding step for decoding said parameters related to said first characteristic, an apparatus for adjusting the first characteristic comprising:

A processor responsive to said digital signals to read at least said first parameter and to generate at least a first parameter value derived from said first parameter (*decoding excitation parameters having associated gain factors, Col. 6, Lines 16-58*);

Responsive to said digital signals and said first parameter value to generate an adjusted first parameter value representing an adjustment of said first characteristic (*adjusting a gain factor with a scaling factor, Col. 7, Line 58- Col. 8, Line 61*); and

Responsive to said adjusted first parameter value to derive an adjusted first parameter and to replace said first parameter with said adjusted first parameter (*replacing an excitation parameter and associated gain with a perceptually adjusted excitation parameter, Col. 7, Line 34- Col. 8, Line 61*).

Jarvinen does not teach the concept of adjusting a gain parameter over a network prior to reception at a receiver, however Yajima discloses the concept of speech signal gain parameter adjustment at a relay node (*Col. 9, Line 35- Col. 10, Line 25; Col. 27, Line 40- Col. 29, Line 10; Col. 31, Lines 12-53; and Figs. 13, and 17-18*).

Jarvinen and Yajima are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech decoding utilizing adaptive gain control. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Jarvinen with the concept of gain adjustment at a relay node as taught by Yajima in order to implement gain adjustment at a means that is capable of connecting two different types of networks (*Col. 3, Lines 25-27*) and coding voice efficiently (*Col. 7, Lines 25-32*), while also inherently decreasing the amount of processing performed at a receiver.

With respect to **Claims 2 and 32**, Jarvinen discloses:

The first characteristic comprises a level of the audio signal (*gain factor that is indicative of a desired speech signal level, Col. 5, Line 25- Col. 6, Line 32; and Col. 12, Lines 24-33*).

With respect to **Claims 3 and 33**, Yajima further discloses:

Yajima teaches avoiding synthesizing filter processing for a normal voice signal that would not require gain adjustment (*Col. 22, Lines 1-24; and adjusting a gain speech parameter, Col. 9, Line 35- Col. 10, Line 25; Col. 27, Line 40- Col. 29, Line 10; Col. 31, Lines 12-53*).

With respect to **Claims 4 and 34**, Yajima teaches synthesizing filter processing, as applied to Claims 3 and 33.

With respect to **Claims 5 and 35**, Jarvinen discloses:

The compression code comprises a linear predictive code (*LP coefficients, Col. 5, Lines 25-57*).

With respect to **Claims 6 and 36**, Jarvinen discloses:

The compression code comprises regular pulse excitation long term prediction code (*LTP prediction coefficients, Col. 5, Lines 25-57*).

With respect to **Claims 10 and 40**, Yajima further discloses gain adjustment implementation at a relay node situated on a network that would inherently be capable of receiving near and far end speech from various transmission nodes connected to the network (*Fig. 16, Element 404; Col. 9, Line 35- Col. 10, Line 25; Col. 27, Line 40- Col. 29, Line 10; Col. 31, Lines 12-53*).

With respect to **Claims 11 and 41**, Jarvinen discloses:

The processor test the adjusted first parameter value for an overflow and underflow condition before deriving the adjusted first parameter (*multiple threshold comparisons, Col. 7, Line 58- Col. 8, Line 61*).

With respect to **Claims 15 and 45**, Jarvinen discloses performing the decoding processing, as applied to Claim 1, on a plurality of parameters from a series of time frames (*Col. 6, Lines 16-58; and Col. 12, Lines 52-54*).

With respect to **Claims 24 and 54**, Jarvinen further discloses:

The processor performs at least the first decoding step to generate decoded signals related to the first characteristic of the audio signal (*recovering speech parameters using a speech decoder, Col. 6, Lines 16-26*).

With respect to **Claim 38**, Jarvinen discloses the use of the CELP coding standard (*Col. 5, Lines 25-35*).

11. **Claims 8-9, 12, 16, 18, 20-23, 39, 42, 46, 48, and 50-53** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima, and further in view of Yasunaga et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,330,534*).

With respect to **Claim 8**, Jarvinen in view of Yajima discloses the speech decoding apparatus utilizing perceptual gain scaling, as applied to Claim 1. Jarvinen in view of Yajima does not explicitly teach the use of the algebraic CELP coding standard, however Yasunaga teaches the use of said standard (*Col. 3, Lines 42-51*).

Jarvinen, Yajima, and Yasunaga are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech decoding utilizing adaptive gain control. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Jarvinen in view of Yajima with the ACELP standard taught by Yasunaga in order to provide a standard that reduces the complexities of computing coding distortions (*Yasunaga, Col. 3, Lines 42-51*).

With respect to **Claim 9**, Jarvinen further teaches the gain scaling factor as applied to claim 1.

With respect to **Claims 12 and 42**, Jarvinen in view of Yajima discloses the speech decoding apparatus utilizing perceptual gain scaling, as applied to Claims 11 and 41. Jarvinen in view of Yajima does not teach that a decoder derives an adjusted speech parameter by quantizing an adjusted speech parameter, however Yasunaga discloses a process for adjusting a gain factor

applied to a speech parameter by quantizing an adjusted target speech parameter (*Col. 30, Line 42- Col. 31, Line 9*).

Jarvinen, Yajima, and Yasunaga are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech decoding utilizing adaptive gain control. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Jarvinen in view of Yajima with the gain adjusting process taught by Yasunaga in order to provide a means for minimizing a quantization error between target and decoded speech parameters (*Yasunaga, Col. 30, Line 42 - Col. 31, Line 9*).

Claims 16 and 46 contain subject matter similar to Claims 12, 15, 42, and 45 and thus, are rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 18 and 48 contains subject matter similar to Claim 12, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

With respect to **Claims 20 and 50**, Yasunaga further discloses scalar quantization performed using a predetermined quantization table (*Col. 12, Lines 10-21*).

With respect to **Claims 21 and 51**, Yasunaga further discloses subframe-based speech processing (*Col. 1, Line 33- Col. 2, Line 9*).

With respect to **Claims 22 and 52**, Yasunaga further discloses:

The processor replaces the first parameter with the adjusted first parameter for a first subframe before processing a subframe following the first subframe (*adjusting gains of processing frames within a speech frame on a frame-by-frame basis, Col. 28, Lines 40-50; and Col. 30, Line 42- Col. 31, Line 9*).

With respect to **Claims 23 and 53**, Yasunaga further discloses adjusting a gain of a current processing frame based on a gain of a previous processing frame (*Col. 30, Line 42- Col. 31, Line 9*), and subframe-based speech processing, as applied to Claims 21 and 51.

Claim 39 contains subject matter similar to Claims 9 and 21, and thus, is rejected for the same reasons.

12. **Claims 7 and 37** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima et al in view of Yasunaga et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,330,534*), and further in view of Crouse et al (*U.S. Patent: 4,899,384*).

With respect to **Claims 7 and 37**, Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima and further in view of Yasunaga teaches the speech decoding apparatus utilizing gain scaling, subframe based processing, and quantization processing, as applied to Claims 6, 21, 36, and 51. Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima and further in view of Yasunaga does not specifically suggest utilizing a maximum absolute value of a speech parameter to derive a speech scaling factor, however Crouse teaches the use of such a value (*Col. 5, Lines 5-16*).

Jarvinen, Yajima, Yasunaga, and Crouse are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech coding systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima and further in view of Yasunaga with the maximum absolute value parameter taught by Crouse in order to implement a speech coded method having reduced peak information that is consistent with a desired speech output quality (*Crouse, Col. 4, Lines 1-11*).

13. **Claims 13-14, 17, 19, 43-44, 47, and 49** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima et al in view of Yasunaga et al, and further in view of Swaminathan et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,751,903*).

With respect to **Claims 13, 17, 19, 43, 47, and 49**, Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima and further in view of Yasunaga teaches the speech decoding apparatus utilizing perceptual gain scaling and quantization processing, as applied to Claims 12, 16, 18, 42, 46, and 48. Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima and further in view of Yasunaga does not teach the use of differential scalar quantization, however Swaminathan discloses the use of such a quantization during speech coding (*Col. 10, Lines 48-56*).

Jarvinen, Yajima, Yasunaga, and Swaminathan are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech coding systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Jarvinen et al in view of Yajima and further in view of Yasunaga with the differential scalar quantization taught by Swaminathan in order to implement a means for quantizing speech parameters that requires a reduced number of bits (*Swaminathan, Col. 8, Lines 65-98*).

With respect to **Claims 14 and 44**, Yasunaga further discloses the use of a feedback loop having a speech parameter quantizer (*Col. 30, Line 42- Col. 31, Line 9; and Fig. 16*), while Swaminathan discloses the use of differential scalar quantization as applied to Claims 13 and 33.

14. **Claims 25-27 and 55-57** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,873,058*) in view of Kwan (*U.S. Patent: 6,504,838*).

With respect to **Claims 25 and 55**, Yajima discloses:

A transmitter transmitting digital signals using a compression code comprising a predetermined plurality of parameters including a first parameter, said parameters representing an audio signal comprising a plurality of audio characteristics including a first characteristic, said first parameter being related to said first characteristic (*transmission node that outputs a coded voice signal, Col. 16, lines 52-60; wherein voice parameters comprise CELP coded speech and associated gain data, Col. 1, Line 33- Col. 2, Line 7; and Col. 9, Lines 52-57*) wherein said compression code being decodable by a plurality of decoding steps including a first decoding step for decoding said parameters related to said first characteristic (*decodable speech parameters including a step for extracting voice parameters from a voice code signal, Col. 9, Line 35- Col. 10, Line 25; Col. 21, Lines 39-50*); and

A processor responsive to said second bits to adjust said first bits and said second bits, whereby said first characteristic is adjusted (*adjusting a gain speech parameter at a relay device, Col. 9, Line 35- Col. 10, Line 25; Col. 27, Line 40- Col. 29, Line 10; Col. 31, Lines 12-53*),

Wherein the processor adjusts the first characteristic without decoding said compression code (*partial decoding of speech parameters, Col. 33, Lines 42-65*).

Yajima does not disclose that gain can be controlled responsive to speech data from a second transmitter in addition to the data from a first transmitter, however, Kwan discloses the concept of gain control for an echo adjusted speech signal utilizing additional speech data initiating from a second transmitter (Col. 10, Line 43- Col. 11, Line 11):

Yajima and Kwan are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech coding systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Yajima with the gain control of an echo

adjusted speech signal taught by Kwan in order to improve voice quality and eliminate user annoyance resulting from an echo-distorted signal (*Kwan, Col. 10, Lines 43-55*).

With respect to **Claims 26 and 56**, Yajima recites:

The linear code comprises PCM code (*ADPCM, Col. 20, Lines 50-53*).

With respect to **Claims 27 and 57**, Yajima discloses:

The first characteristic comprises audio level (*gain parameter which is indicative of an audio level, Col. 9, Line 35- Col. 10, Line 25; Col. 27, Line 40- Col. 29, Line 10; Col. 31, Lines 12-53*).

15. **Claims 28-30 and 58-60** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yajima et al in view of Kwan, and further in view of Navaro et al (*U.S. Patent: 6,108,560*).

With respect to **Claims 28 and 58**, Yajima in view of Kwan discloses the system for adapting speech gain parameter as applied to Claim 25. Yajima in view of Kwan does not teach system implementation in TFO GSM environment, however Navaro teaches speech coding implemented in such an environment (*Col. 6, Lines 11-29*).

Yajima, Kwan, and Navaro are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech coding systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Yajima in view of Kwan with the speech coding implementation in a GSM system as taught by Navaro in order to achieve high quality speech coding in a mobile environment (*Navaro, Col. 1, Line 11- Col. 2, Line 11*).

With respect to **Claims 29-30 and 59-60**, Yajima in view of Kwan teaches adjusting gain for encoded speech parameters as applied to Claim 25, while Navaro further recites the TFO frame format comprising 2 LSBs and 6 MSBs of PCM speech data (*Col. 6, Lines 11-29*).

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Sih (U.S. Patent: 5,307,405)- discloses gain adjustment based on near and far end speech signals.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached at (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James S. Wozniak
1/22/2007


DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2626